

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached Replacement Sheets depicting clean copies of Figures 1-10 are intended to replace the figures currently on file. No substantive changes have been made.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets for Figures 1-10.

### **REMARKS**

Applicants submit this Amendment in response to the final Office Action mailed May 12, 2009. Prior to this Amendment, claims 24-36 were pending in this application. In the final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d); objected to the specification for not including a complete "Brief Description of the Figures" section; and rejected claims 29, 31, 32, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 02/086914 ("Greiner"). The Examiner objected to claims 30, 33, 34, and 36 for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

By this Reply, Applicants have amended independent claim 29 and canceled dependent claim 30 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 29 and 31-36 are submitted for examination. No new matter has been added.

### **Objections to the Drawings**

In the final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because they are not provided with proper cross-section hatching according to MPEP § 608.

In response, Applicants attach Replacement Sheets, depicting clean copies of Figures 1-10.

Accordingly, Applicants' respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner also objected to the specification because a brief description of Figure 10 was not included in the "Brief Description of the Figures" section of the application.

By this Reply, Applicants have amended the specification to add a brief description of Figure 10 at page 18, following line 3. Specifically, the following paragraph has been added to the specification:

figure 10 is a perspective view of one embodiment of a multipolar cable described herein.

Accordingly, Applicants' respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 29, 31, 32, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Greiner. In order to properly establish that Greiner anticipates Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly or described under principles of inherency, in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim." See id., quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Greiner does not disclose every element recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 29. Independent claim 29 has been amended to recite the additional limitations previously recited in now canceled dependent claim 30, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Office Action at 4. Amended independent claim 29 now recites, in part, "a sheath in which at least three longitudinal housings are defined . . . , the longitudinal housings being angularly staggered from

each other by a predetermined angle.” As the Examiner seemingly concedes, nowhere does it appear Greiner discloses such features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Greiner. Moreover, claims 31-36 depend from independent claim 29, and thus, those claims should be patentably distinguishable from Greiner for at least the same reason as independent claim 29.

### **Claim Scope**

It is to be understood that Applicants are in no way intending to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification or abstract and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicants believe that they are entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 29 and 31-36 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendment to claim 29 does not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were earlier claimed in now canceled dependent claim 30. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 29, 2009

By: 

Benjamin D. Bailey  
Reg. No. 60,539

**Attachments:**      **Replacement Sheets depicting Figures 1-10**